

any



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,275	07/14/2003	L. Lloyd Williams	SWA01 P-106	6325
28101	7590	09/22/2005	EXAMINER	
VAN DYKE, GARDNER, LINN AND BURKHART, LLP 2851 CHARLEVOIX DRIVE, S.E. P.O. BOX 888695 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49588-8695			ANWAH, OLISA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,275	WILLIAMS, L. LLOYD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olisa Anwah	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-23 and 25-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

Art Unit: 2645

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,369 (hereinafter Petrunka) in view of Kasiviswanathan (hereinafter Kasiviswanathan).

Regarding claim 30, Petrunka teaches a system for providing a directory service with a direct to voice mail option for voice mail system (VMS) service subscribers, comprising:

a directory service that permits a requesting party to communicate an identifier used to locate a directory record associated with the VMS service subscriber, the directory service being adapted to provide the requesting party with an option to be connected directly to the VMS service subscriber's voice mail box after the record is located (see Figure 4).

Art Unit: 2645

Petrunka does not explicitly explain the claimed means for formulating a common channel signaling initial address message (IAM) containing a redirecting number parameter to connect the requesting party directly to the voice mail box of the VMS service subscriber. Regardless, Kasiviswanathan shows this feature (see column 5). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Petrunka with the IAM message of Kasiviswanathan. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by utilizing AIN technology as suggested by Petrunka (see column 4).

On the subject of claim 31, see Figure 3 of Petrunka.

3. Claims 35, 36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasiviswanathan combined with Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in further view of Tov et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0152402 (hereinafter Tov).

As per claim 35, Kasiviswanathan teaches:

a means for forwarding a message requesting setup of a connection directly to a voice mail box; and

means for receiving the message and formulating a common channel signaling system initial address message (IAM)

Art Unit: 2645

containing a called party number parameter and a redirecting number parameter (column 5).

Kasiviswanathan falls short of showing the directory number of the VMS is inserted in the called party number parameter and a directory number of the VMS service subscriber is inserted in the redirecting number parameter of the IAM. However paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's specification admits this limitation is well known in the art. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kasiviswanathan with the parameters admitted by Applicant. This modification would have improved the convenience of Kasiviswanathan by allowing other information to be included in the IAM as suggested by Kasiviswanathan (see column 5).

Further regarding claim 35, the combination of Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art doesn't meet the claimed limitation of a system for providing a click to voice mail option accessed from a server on an internet protocol (IP) network, comprising a user interface for permitting a requesting party to select the click to voice mail option, the click to voicemail option being associated with a particular

Art Unit: 2645

voice mail box of a voice mail system (VMS) subscriber. Yet Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art with the user interface disclosed by Tov. This modification would have improved the user's convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

With respect to claim 36, see paragraph 0041 of Tov and column 5 of Kasiviswanathan.

On the subject of claim 38, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 39, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 40, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

4. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Dammrose et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,922,468 (hereinafter Dammrose) in further view of Kasiviswanathan.

Regarding claim 16, Petrunka discloses a system for enabling a requesting party to initiate a telephone call directly to a voice mail box associated with a service subscriber to a voice mail system (VMS), comprising:

Art Unit: 2645

a call control node configured as a service switching point in a switched telephone network, the call control node being adapted to receive a connection request message sent in response to a request to access the voice mail box by a calling party, the connection request message requesting setup of a direct call to a voice mail box, and to respond to the connection request message by formulating a call set-up message to initiate establishment of a call connection to the VMS, so that the VMS provides access to the voice mail box (see Figure 4).

Petrunka fails to teach the call control node is a configured as a virtual service switching point. Nonetheless, Dammrose discloses this limitation (see column 9). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Petrunka with the virtual service switching point taught by Dammrose. This modification would have improved the convenience of Petrunka by monitoring communications for the purpose of service billing as suggested by Dammrose.

Further regarding claim 16, the combination of Petrunka and Dammrose does not explicitly state the call set-up message having a format reserved for redirected call set-up messages

Art Unit: 2645

used by service switching points (SSPs) to redirect uncompleted calls to the service subscriber. All the same, Kasiviswanathan discloses this limitation (see column 5). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka and Dammrose with the call set-up messages of Kasiviswanathan. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by utilizing AIN technology as suggested by Petrunka (see column 4).

On the issue of claim 17, see column 5 of Kasiviswanathan.

5. Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Dammrose and Kasiviswanathan in further view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

The combination of Petrunka, Dammrose and Kasiviswanathan teaches a means for formulating an IAM including a called party number parameter and a redirecting number parameter in conformance with the SS7 standard (see column 5 of Kasiviswanathan). However this combination falls short of showing the directory number of the VMS is inserted in the called party number parameter and a directory number of the VMS



Art Unit: 2645

service subscriber is inserted in the redirecting number parameter of the IAM. However paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's specification admits this limitation is well known in the art. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further alter the combination of Petrunka, Dammrose and Kasiviswanathan with the parameters admitted by Applicant. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing other information to be included in the IAM as suggested by Kasiviswanathan (see column 5).

On the issue of claim 19, see paragraph 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 20, see Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Regarding claim 21, see column 9 of Dammrose, Figure 4 of Petrunka and paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 22, see Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Regarding claim 23, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2645

6. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Dammrose, Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in further view of Tov.

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Petrunka, Dammrose, Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art fails to teach the claimed server. Nonetheless Tov discloses this mechanism (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka, Dammrose, Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art with the server disclosed by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

Regarding claim 26, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 27, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 28, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 29, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2645

7. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Kasiviswanathan in view of Tov.

With respect to claim 32, the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan does not disclose the claimed server. Nonetheless Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan with the web page taught by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Kasiviswanathan in view of Dammrose.

On the issue of claim 33, the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan teaches the means for formulating a common channel signaling initial address message (IAM) is a call control node (CCN) that is configured as a switching point in the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and a physical node in a common channel signaling network of the PSTN (see column 5 of Kasiviswanathan).

Art Unit: 2645

The combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan fails to teach the call control node is configured as a virtual service switching point. Nonetheless, Dammrose discloses this limitation (see column 9). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan with the virtual service switching point taught by Dammrose. This modification would have improved system's convenience by monitoring communications for the purpose of service billing as suggested by Dammrose.

9. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Kasiviswanathan and Dammrose in further view of Tov.

Regarding claim 34 the combination of Petrunka, Kasiviswanathan and Dammrose doesn't teach the claimed Internet Protocol (IP) network. Nonetheless Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka, Kasiviswanathan and Dammrose with the web page taught by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by

Art Unit: 2645

allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

10. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasiviswanathan combined with Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Tov in further view of Dammrose.

As per claim 37, the combination of Kasiviswanathan, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Tov teaches the CCN is configured as a physical node in the common channel signaling network (see column 5 of Kasiviswanathan). However the combination of Kasiviswanathan, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Tov fails to disclose the CCN is configured as a virtual switching point in a switched telephone network associated with the common channel signaling network. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Kasiviswanathan, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Tov with the virtual service switching point taught by Dammrose. This modification would have improved system's convenience by monitoring communications for the purpose of service billing as suggested by Dammrose.

Art Unit: 2645

***Allowable Subject Matter***

11. Claim 24 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant argues that in Petrunka, the requesting party cannot initiate a telephone call directly to the voice mailbox. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Similar to paragraph 0010 of Applicant's invention, Petrunka permits a directory service to offer callers the option of direct access to a selected service subscriber's voice mail box (see Figure 4).

***Conclusion***

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the


Art Unit: 2645

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned  
are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for  
After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status  
of this application or proceeding should be directed to the  
receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

O.A.

Olisa Anwah  
Patent Examiner  
September 14, 2005

  
FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600